



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/465,879	12/16/1999	JOHN L. BEEZER	3797.84611	9430

28319 7590 02/13/2002

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/465,879

Applicant(s)

JOHN L. BEEZER

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Objections***

Claims 1 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: "displaying at least a portion of the electronic document to the user as an immersive reading page" should be changed to "displaying at least a portion of the electronic document to a user as an immersive reading page". Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

In line 7, page 23, "For example" should be avoided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mangat et al [US. 6,081,814] in view of Stern et al. [US. 5,835,919].

As to claims 1 and 9, Mangat et al. discloses associating with an element of the immersive reading page enhanced page functionality (column 7, lines 7-60). Mangat et al. cites "A reference environment manager may create, modify, and access multiple environment...." read as the enhanced page functionality. "An environment may be so navigated, to identify a reference, as may directory services objects associated with a document..." read as the element associates with the functionality (See abstract); providing the user access to the enhanced functionality in response to the user selecting the element of the immersive reading page (see column 8, lines 3-54). Mangat et al. cites "Viewing , evaluating, and the like may involve user interaction....The select reference step selects are a reference listed in a reference environment. The reference may then be used for further action by a user... " read as user access to the enhanced functionality in response to the user selecting the element. The difference between the claim and Mangat et al. is displaying at least a portion of the electronic document to the user as an immersive reading page, the immersive reading page mimicing a printed paper. Stern et al. shows displaying at least a portion of the electronic document to the user as an immersive reading page, the immersive reading page mimicing a printed paper (see abstract). Stern cites "A document-centered user interface architecture for a computer system". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mangat et al. and Stern et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the user access to the enhanced functionality taught by Mangat et al. to include the electronic document of Stern et al., in order to obtain an electronic document to foster an immersive reading page as taught by Stern et al.

As to claims 2 and 10, Mangat et al. also discloses the immersive reading page provides no visual indication to the user of the enhanced functionality except for the element of the immersive reading page (Fig. 3, column (column 15, lines 22-59).

As to claims 3 and 11, Mangat et al. teaches the enhanced functionality is transparently associated with the element of the immersive reading page (column 10, lines 48 through column 11, lines 7).

As to claims 4 and 12, Mangat et al. also teaches the step of invoking a training mode for teaching the association to a user (column 10, lines 40-64 and column 18, lines 32-65).

As to claims 5 and 13, Mangat et al. shows the element is a page number and the step of associating comprises associating intrabook navigational functionality with the page number (column 15, lines 36-48 and column 7, lines 7-56).

As to claims 6 and 14, Mangat et al. also shows the element is a title line and the step of associating comprises associating interbook navigational functionality with the title line (column 16, lines 32-55 and column 7, lines 35-55).

As to claims 7 and 15, Mangat et al. discloses the element is content and the step of associated comprises associating content interaction functionality with the content (column 25, lines 19-56).

As to claims 8 and 16, Mangat et al. demonstrates the step of associating comprises the step of associating a first category of enhanced functionality with a first category of element on the immersive reading page (column 7, lines 35-55).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 (c) to

Art Unit: 2173

consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach the storage area network management and configuration system and the communication information he communication information includes e-mail information and pager information.

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238, may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-4395 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8.00AM to 4.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

Art Unit: 2173

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2173

C. De la Torre

**CRESCELLE N. DELA TORRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**